Case 1:01-cv-05241-OWW-DLB Document 45 Filed 05/05/05 Page 1 of 4

```
QUIN DENVIR, Bar #49374
 1
    Federal Defender
 2
    ALLISON CLAIRE, Bar #170138
    Assistant Federal Defender
 3
    801 I Street, 3rd Floor
    Sacramento, California 95814
    Telephone: (916) 498-5700
 4
 5
    Attorneys For Petitioner
 6
    RAY LEE VAUGHN
 7
 8
                       IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 9
                      FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10
11
12
                                        NO. CIV 01-5241 OWW DLB HC
    RAY LEE VAUGHN,
13
                    Petitioner,
14
                                         STIPULATION AND ORDER EXTENDING
                                        TIME TO FILE PETITIONER'S
          V.
15
                                         SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF RE: PROCEDURAL
    D. ADAMS,
                                        DEFAULT
16
                    Respondent.
17
18
19
```

Petitioner, RAY LEE VAUGHN, and respondent, D. ADAMS, by and through their respective counsel, hereby agree and stipulate as follows:

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

28

- 1. Respondent's supplemental brief regarding procedural default was filed on February 24, 2005. The deadline for petitioner's supplemental brief was thereafter extended, by stipulation and order, to May 12, 2005. For the reasons set forth below, the parties agree that a second continuance is necessary and appropriate.
- 2. Pursuant to Bennett v. Mueller, 322 F.3d 573, 585-86 (9^{th} Cir. 2003), petitioner must place the affirmative defense of procedural

2.4

default at issue by asserting specific factual allegations to demonstrate the inadequacy of the state's procedural rule. To meet this initial burden of production, petitioner is gathering documentation of non-capital habeas cases in which the rule of <u>In re Dixon</u>, 41 Cal.2d 756 (1953), could have been, but was not, applied by the California Supreme Court during the general time period of petitioner's purported default. Under <u>Bennett</u>, once petitioner makes this showing the burden will shift to the state to prove that the procedural rule is regularly and consistently applied.

- 3. In order to make the required showing, petitioner must undertake extensive review of California Supreme Court closed habeas case files, and compare the petitions against the direct appeals in each case. Very little of the necessary data, and few of the necessary documents, are available on-line or in published opinions.
- 4. As set forth below, petitioner has been diligent in attempting to gather the necessary data and documents:
- a. Beginning in early March, counsel identified a pool of approximately 600 California habeas cases that had been decided by the California Supreme Court in 1997. We determined that approximately 450 of these were related to federal habeas cases filed in the Eastern District. Online review of federal dockets and (where available) Findings and Recommendations identified, by process of elimination, approximately 20 cases which could involve petitioners similarly situated to Mr. Vaughn.
- b. Specified portions of the record, filed in the federal cases, were then requested from district court archives in Sacramento and Fresno, and copies ordered. Following another round of preliminary review and elimination, original state court documents were ordered

Case 1:01-cv-05241-OWW-DLB Document 45 Filed 05/05/05 Page 3 of 4

1	from the Fifth District Court of Appeal and the California Supreme
2	Court during the last week of April. The case files are archived.
3	Those documents have not yet been recieved.
4	5. Petitioner requires additional time to review the
5	documents already received, receive the documents ordered but not yet
6	received, screen all cases for their applicability to the issues
7	presented in this case, and conduct follow-up research as necessary.
8	6. For these reasons, petitioner respectfully requests a 30-
9	day extension of time, up to and including June 12, 2005, in which to
10	prepare and file his supplemental brief. Respondent has no objection
11	to this request.
12	7. Counsel for respondent, Deputy Attorney General Justain
13	P. Riley, has authorized the undersigned to sign this stipulation
14	electronically on his behalf.
15	Dated: May 5, 2005 Respectfully submitted,
16	QUIN DENVIR
17	Federal Defender
18	
19	<u>/s/ Allison Claire</u> ALLISON CLAIRE
20	ABBISON CLAIRE Assistant Federal Defender Attorney for Petitioner
21	RAY LEE VAUGHN
22	
23	<u>/s/ Justain P. Riley</u> JUSTAIN P. RILEY
24	Deputy Attorney General Attorney for Respondents
25	D. ADAMS
26	

27

28

Case 1:01-cv-05241-OWW-DLB Document 45 Filed 05/05/05 Page 4 of 4

ORDER Pursuant to the stipulation of the parties, and for good cause shown, petitioner's request for a second extension of time is hereby GRANTED. Petitioner's supplemental brief regarding procedural default shall be filed no later than June 12, 2005. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: <u>May 5, 2005</u> /s/ Dennis L. Beck ah0l4d UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE